

REMARKS

Applicant's filed an Amendment After Final on November 10, 2003. This supplements that Amendment.

Claim 2 was objected to and that objection was addressed in the previous Amendment After Final.

Claims 2-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over various combinations of Johnson et al., Pottebaum, DeLuca et al., Jo and Hoppal et al., all of record. In an Advisory Action dated December 5, 2003, the examiner has noted that the Declaration of Richard K. Williams has been considered but not deemed persuasive because, while it explains the significance of having the PCB face the bracket, the examiner contends that the arrangement is taught in Figs. 5 and 8 of Pottebaum.

A significant aspect of the invention is the provision of a combination of a disc drive assembly and a channel-shaped, damped mounting bracket, wherein the disc drive assembly has an integral PCB thereon, the parts being arranged so that the PCB faces toward the base wall of the channel-shaped bracket. It is important that the PCB not only face the base wall of the bracket, but that the bracket be a damped, laminated bracket. As can be seen from the exhibit to the Williams Declaration, all of the various arrangements tested which utilized a "reversed" orientation of the disc drive, so that its PCB faced the base wall of the bracket, utilized a damped, laminated bracket (designated "DML," which stands for "damped metal laminate").

In Pottebaum there really is nothing corresponding to applicants' claimed "bracket" disposed between the PCB and associated support structure. The Pottebaum chassis 90 cannot be such a bracket, since it is interposed between the PCB and the base deck of the disc drive. In any event, Pottebaum does not disclose a damped bracket. Rather, Pottebaum provides the damping in the housing of the disc drive base deck.

It is true that Johnson discloses a bracket formed of a laminated damping material, but there is no suggestion of mounting a disc drive with a PCB facing the base wall of such a bracket.

Presumably, the examiner contends that it would have been obvious in view of Pottebaum for Johnson et al. to invert his disc drive in the bracket. But it is submitted that there would have been no incentive for one of ordinary skill in the art to do so, since there is no indication in the art that such an inversion would make any difference. Since Pottebaum does not disclose a bracket at all, it cannot teach anything about orienting a disc drive relative to such a bracket. Furthermore, there is no incentive for Pottebaum to use a damped bracket, since he provides the damping in the disc drive itself.

In order to clarify these distinctions, claim 7 has been amended to specify “an undamped” disc drive assembly which has a PCB on one side thereof “independent the bracket”. This clearly distinguishes from the arrangement of Pottebaum, which uses a damped disc drive assembly in which the PCB is integral with the drive only through the chassis 90. There is simply no suggestion in the art of the specific combination claimed by applicants.

With respect to method claim 16, it has been amended similarly to claim 7 to recite a method of damping vibrations in “an undamped” disc drive assembly which has an integral PCB. In addition, claim 16 has been amended to incorporate therein, from claim 22, the limitation of providing “flanges on the side walls” of the bracket and “mounting the flanges on an associated substrate with second fasteners.” This arrangement is not disclosed in the art. While the Pottebaum chassis flanges 98 are mounted on an underlying substrate by fasteners 100, those are the same fasteners which serve to mount the disc drive PCB to the chassis.

Claim 22 has been accordingly amended.

In view of the foregoing it is believed that, as amended, each of claims 2-23 is now in condition for allowance and the allowance thereof is respectfully asked.

Respectfully submitted,

Seyfarth Shaw LLP
Attorneys for Assignee
55 East Monroe Street
Suite 4200
Chicago, Illinois 60603-5803
312-346-8000

By 